DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 514 UD 009 772

TITLE	Annual Evaluation Report. Title I Programs, Fiscal Year 1969, ESEA.
INSTITUTION	Alabama State Dept. of Education, Montgomery.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	46p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.40
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, Delinquents, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, Physically Handicapped, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS	Alabama, *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I Program, ESEA Title I Programs

ABSTRACT

Format of this report is a question and answer series (with tables appended) which presents the standardized required information for Federal evaluating purposes. Cooperative efforts between State Education Association and Local Education Association staff members, test results from standardized tests, and special education programs for retarded, handicapped, delinquent, and neglected children (cost analysis chart included) are described. Discussion of coordination of ESEA Title I programs with other Federally funded programs, inservice training programs for teachers and teacher aides, and community and parent involvement and identification of achievement, psychological, and intelligence tests are also presented. [Page 7 of this document has not been photographed due to the marginal legibility in the original document.] (KG)

ED037514

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
TITLE I PROGRAMS
FISCAL YEAR 1969

Title I of Public Law 89-10

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

STATE OF ALABAMA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA 36104

UD008722

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Ernest Stone
State Superintendent of Education

ED037514

STATE OF ALABAMA

Governor . . . . . Albert P. Brewer

State Superintendent of Education . . . . . Ernest Stone

State Board of Education

Dr. James D. Nettles	S. M. Beck
Ed Dannelly	Victor Poole
Mrs. Carl Strang	W. C. Davis
Fred L. Merrill	Cecil Word
Rev. Harold C. Martin	

Division of Administration and Finance

W. H. Kimbrough, Director
J. H. Boockholdt, Assistant Director

Title I Staff

W. E. Mellown, Jr.	Coordinator
E. A. Spear	Assistant Coordinator
C. M. Youngblood	Consultant, P. L. 89-313
G. W. Hause	Consultant
J. L. Kelly	Consultant
Ann Harmon	Evaluation Consultant

Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1969

This report is based on the list of questions supplied by the U. S. Office of Education.

STATE TITLE I, ESEA EVALUATION

QUESTIONS FOR FY 1969

I. Provide the following basic State statistics:

A. Total number of operating LEA's in the state	118
B. Number of LEA's participating in Title I	117
1. During regular school term	117
2. During summer term only	None
3. During both regular and summer	101
C. Number of Title I programs	117
D. Number of Title I participants	664,271
1. Public schools	652,290
2. Private	6,418
3. Not enrolled	
(Library Services, Recreational, Dropout Programs	5,563
E. Number of institutions participating	5
Number of children in institutions	1,979

II. During FY 1969, indicate the number of SEA Title I staff visits to LEA's participating in Title I. By objective of visit (planning, program development, program operation, evaluation, etc.), specify the purposes of these visits and their effect on the development, operation, and evaluation of local projects. Indicate proportion of visits, by type.

Each of the 117 LEA's was visited by at least one of the SEA Title I staff members for the purpose of making an administrative review. Forty-six of the systems were reviewed twice. These reviews were to check the program while in operation to see if the LEA's were doing what they had written into their applications. Follow-up letters were written reporting the findings, pointing out any variations being made and making suggestions.

The SEA does not take part in the actual program planning and development

except when asked. Training in writing project proposals was given at area conferences and at a three-day state-wide summer conference.

The LEA coordinators made many visits to the SEA office. They felt free to call or come in any time they had questions or needed help.

Records were kept by the SEA Title I staff members, including the accountant and the statistician. The combined numbers are large because four people may have seen the same person. A LEA coordinator usually saw the consultant assigned to his system, the evaluation consultant, the bookkeeper, statistician, etc. on one trip. Each staff member used the following form on which totals of sheets for 6 staff members are combined.

TITLE I ESEA

INVOLVEMENT OF STAFF MEMBERS IN CONFERENCES AND FIELD SERVICES FY 69

1. Office conferences with educators	960
Office conferences with others	347
Telephone conferences with LEA's	1,572
2. Participation in Educational Conferences	
Local	80
Statewide	6
Regional	56
National	20
Other educational conferences attended	3
Regular staff meetings	60
Planning meetings for conferences	18
3. Field Services	
Days spent in the field	360
Visits to schools	236
Meetings with administrators	160
Meetings with school staff groups	100
Meetings with lay groups	28
Meetings with college or university groups	60

III. Describe any changes your agency has made in the last three years in its procedures and the effect of such changes to:
A. improve the quality of Title I projects
B. insure proper participation of nonpublic school children
C. modify local projects in the light of State and local evaluation.

A. The quality of Title I projects improved as the LEA staff members became more capable of planning and administering the programs. The greatest difficulty has been in helping the LEA's adjust programs at the last minute due to the closing of schools by court orders. The amount spent on equipment was reduced while the amount spent on personnel increased. More questions were asked about whether proposed programs, such as guidance and driver education, were supplanting rather than supplementing or were also being funded through another source. LEA's were urged to plan more for the elementary level than for secondary level, to phase out as many remedial projects as possible and to begin preventive measures.

B. The SEA felt no need to modify its criteria for program approval providing for children enrolled in non-public schools. Only 44 non-public schools have been eligible for services. These were mainly parochial schools which are discussed in Part V. Other non-public schools were organized to take the children out of integrated schools. They were not in compliance with the Civil Rights Act and had no wish for any federal aid.

The coordinator of governmental programs named by the superintendent of the Catholic schools attended the Title I workshops and met with public school coordinators to help plan programs. He furnished information needed for determining eligibility of the parochial schools and provided lists of needs of the schools. He and the LEA staff members enjoy a good relationship. Children from non-public schools were urged to take part in the summer programs. A sample report from one system follows.

BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Early in the 1968-69 academic year, private and parochial schools in Birmingham were notified by letter of the rights and privileges under ESEA, Title I of qualifying schools. As a follow-up of this letter, the Superintendent of Schools for the Mobile-Birmingham Catholic Diocese made a survey of the economic level of pupils attending parochial schools and found that two of the existing schools would qualify for services under Title I. Plans were then made for these two schools to be included in the Elementary Counseling and Reading programs for the 1969-70 academic year. Father Houck and Mr. Charles Pafenbach, representing the parochial schools of Birmingham, felt that the students in the parochial schools would probably need and make more extensive use of the summer program than the programs offered during the school year. In the middle of May, notices describing the summer program were sent to the parochial schools for distribution to all students enrolled. Of the 15,286 pupils enrolled in 14 different programs 1,259 or approximately 9% came from parochial schools. No private schools in this area were in compliance with the Civil Rights Act.

C. The LEA projects were affected by evaluation requirements. They had to state specifically how each program would be evaluated. This caused them to cut down on the number of projects to be implemented. The LEA's which did not have trained personnel for grading and interpreting tests have written into their budgets a sum for evaluation. The SEA evaluation consultant assisted in 12 LEA workshops. She shared copies of checklists and other evaluation materials with the LEA's at area meetings. The SEA provided a format for evaluation reporting. Evaluation was discussed at five area meetings and one state-wide meeting conducted by the State.

IV. Effect upon Education Achievement

A. What effect, if any, has Title I had upon the educational achievement of educationally deprived children including those children enrolled in nonpublic schools in your State? On the basis of objective State-wide evidence - not testimonials or examples but hard data --describe the impact on reading achievement levels of educationally deprived pupils, including nonpublic school pupils. With standardized achievement test results, compare the achievement of participants in Title I projects to that of all pupils of the same grade level in the State using current national and statewide norms and specify the norms used. All evidence should be based on the educational performance of a significant number of Title I participants in your State. Indicate the number of Title I participants for which data are presented.

B. What are common characteristics of those Title I projects in your State that are most effective in improving educational achievement?

C. What evidence, if any, have you found in your State that the effectiveness of Title I projects is related to cost?

A. Objective data

Test results from standardized tests are on pages 31 - 36. These results were given because there were more of them. The LEA's chose the reading programs they wished to use and the tests they used. Many used tests that came with the reading materials. Therefore, a variety of tests were used. The teachers wrote many glowing reports of progress and human interest stories. They were enthusiastic and pleased with the progress

made even though standardized test results do not show much. The lack of progress shown was often due to the facts that many of the pupils had no test experience and had not been trained to follow directions, some of the teachers had no experience in administering standardized tests, and the tests were not designed for deprived children.

Very few experiments with control groups were done. A majority of the school administrators do not approve the use of control groups and make no provisions for follow-up studies.

B. The most effective programs were in intensive reading programs which were aided through teacher-training; use of aides and more and better supplies and equipment; the supplying of food and health services; and the cultural enrichment programs. The effects were cumulative rather than separable.

C. Earlier effectiveness was directly related to cost due to the need for supplies, equipment and facilities. The need for those things has leveled off, but the need for trained personnel, or the training of personnel has increased. Therefore, the effectiveness of the programs was still related to cost.

V. What effect, if any, has the Title I program had on the administrative structure and educational practices of your State Education Agency, Local Education Agencies, and nonpublic schools:

Title I has had a definite effect on the SEA, LEA's, and nonpublic schools in areas not covered in Part III above. The SEA, through necessity, became more involved than ever before in working with the local systems. The SEA was

more aware of the problems of assessing needs and in staffing and administering programs which beset the LEA's. Through visiting and helping, workshops and conferences, the SEA became more conscious of the needs and problems and of the part it must play.

The LEA's were more conscious of the need for long-range planning. There was more sharing of experiences and problems as mutual involvement grew. Practices used in special Title I programs have spilled over into the regular program. The involvement of parents has also grown. Reports of parent and community involvement are attached.

The SEA and LEA's had more communication with the nonpublic schools which saw an advantage in becoming a part of the total school program.

The school program in Alabama has been upgraded by having the use of Title I funds to meet needs in instruction, services, and training, and by having specific procedures to follow in planning and administering programs.

VI. Additional Efforts to Help the Disadvantaged

A. If State funds have been used to augment Title I programs, describe the number of projects, objectives of the programs, rationale for increased funding with State money, and the amount and proportion of total program funds provided by the State for the 1968-69 school year. Indicate the number of projects, number of participants, objectives of the programs, and the level of funding for the 1968-69 school year. Provide data separately for all compensatory education programs, if any, supported entirely by State funds which were operated specifically for the educationally deprived.

The funds appropriated by the State for the programs described below are supplementary to other funds which may be federal or local.

1. Free Textbooks - To guarantee that all children had access to needed books the state appropriated $2,078,500 for textbooks.

2. Exceptional Children - The State paid for 544 classroom teachers

and for transportation to centers. The classes were for mentally retarded, physically handicapped, speech disorders, emotionally disturbed, asphasoid, hard-of-hearing, home bound, socially maladjusted, and trainable. In addition to paying the teachers as regular teacher units and supplying transportation for those able to ride a regular school bus, appropriations were as follows:

Educable - $3,291,862.84 Trainable - $ 318,690.00

These classes were held within the buildings where other classes were held, when feasible. Teachers were required to hold a major in special education as specified by the State Department of Education (Certification). Each child had a complete physical and mental evaluation. The teacher-pupil ratio was held very low, and teaching was on an individual basis.

3. Three Industrial Schools - Appropriation $1,210,544 - for delinquent and neglected children. These schools provided academic instruction and industrial training. Living quarters, food, and clothing were provided. Residents worked on projects which trained the students for future jobs and brought some income to the school. Psychologists and counselors worked with the residents for a change in attitude and up-grading of self-image. Teaching techniques were those needed as indicated by test results. Teaching was individualized as much as possible.

4. Partlow State School - For retarded children. The State appropriation was $193,582.00. This school is adjacent to the campus of a State mental institution which receives a fairly large appropriation. Many of the services available in the mental institution were also available

to Partlow through the use of stategrown food supply, use of medical doctors, psychologists, chaplains, art and craft teachers, and faciiitites for these activities. Many private organizations make regular contributions to the school.

Techniques used were those used for special classes for mentally retarded children. The children live there the year round, so much training is given in group living. The atmosphere is excellent, but the facilities are very overcrowded. The pupils appear very happy. They look forward to training in the crafts shop, singing in the chapel, picnics, etc. Student teachers from the nearby University of Alabama who are majoring in guidance and counseling, special education, speech therapy, music, art, etc. spend many hours with the children.

5. Alabama Institute for the Deaf and Blind received a State appropriation of $1,601,147. A State-owned farm supplements the income by supplying fresh vegetable, poultry, pork, and beef for the students, all of which live on the campus. There is also a meat processing plant. This institution also gains some income from the sale of art and craft objects made by the students and sold by members of service clubs and religious and professional groups. These groups also make contributions to the school as part of their service projects.

   Techniques used are those which are most suited to the particular handicap.

State Department of Education
Division of Administration and Finance

May 15, 1969

ALABAMA SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL TRUST FUND APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1968-69, 1969-70, AND 1970-71

	1968-69 Absolute & Conditional Appropriations		1969-70 Absolute Appropriation	1969-70 Conditional Appropriation		1970-71 Absolute Appropriation	1970-71 Conditional Appropriation	
Alabama A. & M. College 1/	$ 2,008,113.00		$ 2,339,452.00	$ --		$ 2,417,325.00	$ 137,357.00	
Alabama State College 1/	2,029,185.00		2,364,000.00	--		2,442,690.00	138,798.00	
Auburn University	15,600,750.00		18,161,077.00	500,000.00		18,756,879.00	1,565,827.00	
Auburn University — Montgomery	--		1,000,000.00	--		1,135,480.00	64,520.00	
Florence State University	95,500.00		1,970,966.00	121,200.00		2,039,071.00	223,273.00	
Jacksonville State University	95,500.00		3,123,569.00	192,100.00		3,227,734.00	357,631.00	
Jacksonville State University Nursing School 1/	250,000.00		250,000.00	--		250,000.00	--	
Livingston State University 1/	338,500.00	2/	1,071,934.00	65,900.00		1,111,474.00	118,913.00	
Troy State University	88,500.00		1,964,051.00	120,800.00		2,031,461.00	222,971.00	
Troy State University School of Nursing	--		--	200,000.00		--	200,000.00	
Teacher Training Equalization Fund	6,181,802.00		--	3/ --		--	3/ --	
University of Alabama	19,645,296.00		24,293,857.00	1,306,000.00		25,191,882.00	2,294,173.00	
University of Montevallo (Alabama College)	1,567,006.00		1,825,562.00	200,000.00		1,886,329.00	157,185.00	
University of South Alabama	3,133,155.00		3,650,125.00	300,000.00		3,771,625.00	514,311.00	
Adult Basic Education (Removal of Illiteracy)	100,000.00		116,500.00	--		120,378.00	6,840.00	
Civil Defense Survival Plan	9,037.50		10,528.00	--		10,879.00	618.00	
Civilian Rehabilitation	1,335,434.00	4/	1,987,726.00	--		2,010,032.00	113,645.00	
Coordination of In-School T.V. Program	23,397.00		50,000.00	--		49,677.00	2,823.00	
Free Textbooks	2,078,500.00	5/	1,756,452.00	--		1,744,508.00	127,537.00	
Minimum Program	172,690,214.00		201,230,264.00	--		207,899,362.00	11,813,221.00	
Minimum Program-- Trainable Exceptional Children	318,690.00		371,274.00	--		383,632.00	21,799.00	
National Defense Education	127,250.00		148,246.00	--		153,181.00	8,704.00	
Physical Restoration of Crippled Children	1,092,361.00		1,372,600.00	--		1,409,584.00	80,095.00	
Plans and Surveys	29,605.00		34,490.00	--		35,638.00	2,025.00	
State Department of Education	653,257.20		761,044.00	--		786,377.00	44,683.00	
State Tenure Commission	2,000.00		2,000.00	--		2,000.00	--	
Vocational Education	8,383,171.00		10,766,394.00	--		11,037,719.00	627,183.00	
	$186,842,916.70 64.01%		$218,607,518.00 62.76%			$225,642,967.00 62.99%	$12,849,173.00 47.43%	
Alabama Boys Industrial School	442,389.46		515,384.00	--		532,539.00	30,260.00	
Alabama Education Study Commission	32,972.83		155,000.00	--		155,000.00	--	
Alabama Education T.V. Commission	664,806.64		1,052,250.00	--		1,068,919.00	61,738.00	
Alabama Education T.V. Commission - Montgomery	66,738.73		--	--		--	--	
Alabama Industrial School — Mt. Meigs	334,686.28		389,909.00	--		402,888.00	22,893.00	
Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind	1,601,147.00		1,609,281.00	--		1,666,376.00	90,959.00	
Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind--Trade School	100,000.00		372,555.00	--		384,956.00	21,874.00	
Ala. Scholarships for Dependents of Blind Parents	5,000.00		5,250.00	--		5,250.00	--	
Alabama State Hospitals for Schools	25,000.00		29,125.00	--		27,559.00	1,566.00	
American Legion Auxiliary	3,000.00		3,000.00	--		3,000.00	--	
Anniston Memorial Hosp.--Nurses Training	40,000.00		--	--		--	--	
Capital Outlay: A. & M. College	540,000.00		--	750,000.00		--	--	
Alabama State College	--		--	--		--	750,000.00	
Ala. Trade Sch. & Jr. Col. Auth.	--		1,000,000.00	2,000,000.00		--	3,000,000.00	
All School Boards of Education 6/	--		--	$11,900,000.00		--	--	
Elba City Board of Education	--		--	160,000.00		--	--	
Etowah County Board of Education	--		--	400,000.00		--	--	
Fayette County Board of Education	--		--	400,000.00		--	--	
Franklin County Board of Education	--		--	145,000.00		--	--	
Geneva County Board of Education	--		--	150,000.00		--	--	
Jacksonville State Univ. Nursing Sch.	200,000.00		--	--		--	--	
Livingston State Univ. Hospital	--		--	250,000.00		--	--	
Morgan County Board of Education	--		--	--		--	200,000.00	
Wilcox County Board of Education	--		--	180,000.00		--	180,000.00	
Commission on Higher Education	--		90,000.00	--		90,000.00	--	
Debt Service (Estimated)	1,258,875.78		1,276,013.75	--		1,273,120.00	--	
Dental Scholarships	83,000.00		83,000.00	--		83,000.00	--	
Driver Education	--		--	300,000.00		--	300,000.00	
Elementary Teachers Scholarship Fund	25,000.00		25,000.00	--		25,000.00	--	
Employees Insurance (Estimated)	40,000.00		50,000.00	--		50,000.00	--	
J. F. Ingram State Voc. Tech. Sch. - Draper Prison	126,250.00		147,081.00	--		151,976.00	8,636.00	
Junior College Equalization Account	6,747,403.00		9,360,724.00	--		9,541,732.00	542,179.00	
Manpower Development Training Act	100,000.00		100,000.00	--		100,000.00	--	
Marion Institute - Private	75,000.00		75,000.00	--		75,000.00	--	
Medical Scholarships	135,000.00		135,000.00	--		135,000.00	--	
Mobile Gen. Hosp. Medical & Nursing Education	370,000.00		370,000.00	200,000.00		370,000.00	200,000.00	
Partlow State School	193,582.00		225,523.00	--		233,030.00	13,241.00	
Regional Education	--		220,000.00	--		100,000.00	--	
Social Security (Estimated)	12,900,000.00		13,643,000.00	--		14,604,165.00	829,835.00	
Southern Ind. Inst. (Lyman Ward) - Private	42,617.00		42,617.00	--		42,617.00	--	
State Training School for Girls	246,328.60		311,973.00	--		321,526.00	16,849.00	
Sylacauga Nurses Training School	40,000.00		40,000.00	--		40,000.00	--	
Teachers Retirement System (Estimated)	19,751,237.00		24,926,500.00	--		25,546,448.00	1,386,052.00	
Teachers Special Pension Fund	--		1,453,500.00	--		1,091,480.00	62,020.00	
Trade School Equalization Account	6,910,325.00		9,050,529.00	--		9,264,739.00	526,439.00	
Tuskegee Institute - Private	470,000.00		470,000.00	--		470,000.00	--	
Veterans Education Benefits (Estimated)	400,000.00		400,000.00	--		400,000.00	--	
Walker County Junior College - Private	44,460.00		75,000.00	--		75,000.00	--	
TOTAL	$291,891,043.02		$348,324,325.75	$ 19,841,000.00		$358,235,237.00	$ 27,088,673.00	

1/ See Capital Outlay.
2/ Includes $250,000 appropriated by Legislature during 1969 Special Session.
3/ See appropriations for State universities.
4/ Includes $50,000 appropriated by Legislature during 1969 Special Session.
5/ Includes $1,000,000 appropriated by Legislature during 1969 Special Session.
6/ $100,000 each -- Guntersville will become a city school system in 1969-70.

SPECIAL EDUCATION, 1968-69

$ 318,690.00	Total Trainable Cost
3,291,862.84	Total Educable Cost
$3,610,552.84	Grand Total, 1968-69

$ 571.15	Trainable Transportation
31,889.00	Educable Transportation
$ 32,460.15	Total Transportation

Educable

Type	No. of Pupils	No. of Classes	Percentage	Total Cost	Cost Per Pupil
				($25,323.05)	
MR	5,284	432	79.41%	$2,588,745.23	$494.71
				($6,565.95)	
PH	430	47	8.64	281,661.74	670.30
ST	3,096	55	10.11	329,583.35	106.45
ED	40	4	.74	24,123.81	603.10
SM	10	1	.18	5,867.95	586.80
LD	75	5	.92	29,991.76	399.89
Total	8,935	544	100.00	$3,259,973.84	x x x
			Transportation	31,889.00	
				$3,291,862.84	$368.00 per Educable pupil

Trainable

$\frac{\$318,690}{695}$ = $458.55 per pupil

Grand Total

$\frac{\$3,610,552.84}{8935+695=9360}$ = $374.93 per pupil

$\frac{\$2,588,745.23 + 318,690 + 25,323.05}{5284 + 695}$ = $\frac{\$2,932,758.28}{5,979.00}$ = $490.51 per MR pupil

NOTE: $31,889 x .7941 = $25,323.05
$31,889 x .2059 = 6,565.95
) $31,889

1968-69 Final Calculation - Educable Exceptional Education

Rank of Certificate	Teacher Units	Salary Allotment	Allocation
I	156.00	$6,288	$ 980,928.00
II	318.69	5,421	1,727,618.49
III	29.00	4,379	126,991.00
IV	17.00	3,692	62,764.00
V	14.00	3,178	44,492.00
Total	534.69	x x x	$ 2,942,793.49

Principals' Supplement (476.00 Teacher Units x $72)	34,272.00
Total Salaries	$ 2,977,065.49
Transportation	31,889.00
Capital Outlay (476.00 Teacher Units x $68.437527)	32,576.26
Other Current Expense (476.00 Teacher Units x $525.9077626)	250,332.09
Total Costs	$ 3,291,862.84

Homebound, Hospital, and Clinic Units*:

	Rank I	Rank II	Rank III	Rank IV	Rank V	Total
Counties	4.50	19.25	1.00	.00	1.00	25.75
Cities	13.00	19.94	.00	.00	.00	32.94
Total	17.50	39.19	1.00	.00	1.00	58.69

* Principals' Supplement, Capital Outlay, and Other Current Expense not allowed for 58.69 Homebound, Hospital, and Clinic units.

CALCULATION OF TRAINABLE PROGRAM, 1968-69

A. Funds Available

Regular Appropriation	$ 307,850.00
Conditional Appropriation	10,840.00
Total	$ 318,690.00

B. Trainable Program Allocation

Administration Expenses	$ 34,140.00
Salaries of Teachers	283,978.85
Transportation	571.15
Total	$ 318,690.00

C. Calculation of Teachers' Salaries

Rank of Certificate	Number of Units	Salary Allotment	Total Allotment (if paid)	Amount Paid by Systems	Full Allocation	Prorated Allocation
I	10	$6,288	$ 62,880	$ 64,082.15	$ 61,778.00	$ 58,807.16
II	38	5,421	205,998	206,023.51	201,188.01	191,513.07
III	2	4,379	8,758	8,758.00	8,758.00	8,336.84
IV	3	3,692	11,076	10,868.00	10,743.00	10,226.38
V	5	3,178	15,890	16,531.00	15,858.00	15,095.40
Total	58	x x x	$304,602	$306,262.66	$298,325.01	$283,978.85

D. Contract-Approved Teacher Units for Trainable Classes

	Rank I	Rank II	Rank III	Rank IV	Rank V	Total
Counties	5	27	0	1	0	33
Cities	5	11	2	2	5	25
Total	10	38	2	3	5	58

B. Provide descriptions of outstanding examples of the coordination of Title I activities with those of other federally funded programs. Identify the other programs and agencies involved.

1. Community Action Agencies -- There are 28 CAA's in Alabama. Thirteen of these agencies serve two or more school districts. These agencies have been very helpful in locating deprived children and assessing needs through surveys. They have helped with parental involvement by acquainting them with services which are available through CAA and Title I and by offering services such as counseling, recreation, and night classes to parents. CAA has supplemented Title I by aiding in preschool services. A CAA program in training practical nurses made use of Title I equipment and supplies.

2. Title II has been the program most coordinated with Title I. Library books and audiovisual materials have been used by Title I participants. Librarians and aides employed under Title I maintain and distribute these materials. Special emphasis is placed on reading and related activities in Title I programs. This effort is enhanced by Title II.

3. Title III E.S.E.A. -- Thirty-six Title III programs were in operation. Those which were most coordinated with Title I were the media centers which served several surrounding areas. Materials and services were invaluable to Title I programs. Title III teacher-training centers and workshops were used by Title I personnel. Cultural arts projects were used by Title I cultural enrichment programs.

4. Title III N.D.E.A. -- Materials bought through this program were used to great advantage by Title I participants.

5. Title IV -- No Title IV projects were operated through the State. Several LEA's had projects which were conducted through a regional manager who works out from the Atlanta office. Those LEA's used Title IV funds for extended school days, tutorial programs, hiring and training personnel, and trips for teachers to view and study innovative methods being used in other areas.

6. Title V -- E.S.E.A. -- Coordination of Title V and Title I within the SEA has effected peripheral benefits to the LEA's. Title I funds were used in conjunction with Title I funds in a study of the organization of the SEA; in providing consultative and technical assistance in academic areas and in special education; in providing leadership and consultative services to schools trying to meet accreditation standards: in collecting and storing information through the use of data processing; through providing services that assist in developing, improving, and expanding activities of the school lunch and transportation programs and of the graphic arts section; and in initiating and implementing an in-service program for all SEA personnel. All of these activities had a positive effect on the LEA's through supplying leadership and services which affected all programs being conducted by them.

Ten percent of the Title V money was distributed to local school systems on the basis of need for planning and/or implementing programs for the development, improvement, or expansion of activities at the local, county, or regional level. All systems were eligible to submit applications for the Flow Through funds. Nine LEA's applied for the funds. The titles of the projects which follow indicate how

the funds were used in programs designed to meet identified needs and that these programs were adaptable to those provided with Title I funds:

Developing Competencies of Professional And Lay Leadership Serving the Cullman City and Adjoining Systems.

The Curriculum Lab as a Basis for the Preparation of Curriculum Guides.

Use of Audio-Visual Aids Technical and Educational Aspects Workshop.

Data Processing Instructional Project - (A pilot program to determine the feasibility of continuing a data processing class).

Team Teaching Grades 6-7-8.

Development of New Teaching Strategies - A Cooperative Approach.

Differential Learning - An Enquiry Approach (To Improve Science Education in the High School of Phenix City).

Cooperative Study by Ten School Systems in Southeast Alabama of the Organizational Structure, Administration and Supervisory Functions Designed to Improve the Effectiveness of the School Program.

7. Title V - A & B, N.D.E.A. -- Title V staff members have aided with Title I evaluations and other testing programs. Title V trained counselors have been paid from Title I funds.

8. N.Y.C. -- Title I coordinators worked closely with the N.Y.C. in cooperative plans for supply work training and night classes. In some LEA's where trainees worked as library trainees and reading center assistants, the "graduates" of this program are now employed as Title I aides and plan to return as students.

VII. Evaluate the success of Title I in bringing compensatory education to children enrolled in nonpublic schools. Include in your evaluation such factors as the number of projects, the quality of projects, the time of the day and/or year when projects are offered, the adaptions to meet the specific educational needs of educationally deprived children in nonpublic schools, changes in legal interpretations,and joint planning with non-public school officials.

There are few nonpublic schools in Alabama which are listed as eligible for Title I funds. These are found in urban areas. Only 15 out of 117 LEA's have non-public schools which are eligible for Title I services. The private schools are made up of students who are financially able to pay for all educational expenses. They refuse to participate in any way. The parochial schools and other nonpublic schools which were eligible to participate in Title I funds did so. There were no special projects written for nonpublic schools. One project was written for each educational agency (county or city system). This project covered all eligible children irregardless of the type of school.

All summer school programs were open to all children who wished to participate. The parents of those children whom the teachers felt really needed to be in summer school were especially urged to send their children.

The programs which were most adapted to the needs of deprived children were the reading, food, health (medical and dental), and cultural enrichment programs. The use of supplies and equipment also helped.

The best example of joint planning was that with the superintendent of the Catholic schools as reported in question 3. Dual enrollment was offered in two urban systems so students from nonpublic schools might take courses offered in public schools which were not offered in nonpublic schools.

During the regular term 6,418 children in 44 nonpublic schools participated

in Title I programs. There were 60 participants in pre-school; 4,171 in in elementary grades and 2,187 in secondary grades from the non-public schools. In the five institutions which participated (delinquent, retarded, blind), there were 1,716 children.

VIII. How many LEA's conducted coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs for education aides and the professional staff members they assist? What was the total number of participants in each project? Describe the general patterns of activities and provide specific examples of outstanding joint training programs.

The use of Teacher-aides increased in Alabama schools. In FY 69 aides were used in 95 LEA's which is 81%. The number of aides used in the regular term was 1872. Seven hundred eighty-five were used in summer programs. These totals do not include nurses' aides. All of those systems using aides held special workshops for the aides and the teachers with whom the aides would work. All systems using aides required the aides to attend in-service sessions during the year and all special workshops. The in-service sessions included special programs dealing with such topics as early childhood education, new school developments, curriculum planning, educational development classes, etc. There were also departmentalized sessions in which teachers and aides worked together (physical education teachers and the aides who would work with them, librarians and aides who would work with them, etc.).

A brochure, "Guidelines on the Employment of Teacher-Aides in Alabama Public Schools," was used by LEA's who used aides. The Title I Coordinator and superintendents held meetings with principals regarding the duties and use of aides in schools. The proper use of the aides was checked carefully by the consultants making administrative reviews of the Title I programs. A form for reporting workshops and in-service programs was included in the evaluation

guide which reminded the LEA's of the Title I amendment concerning the training of aides. A sample copy of the in-service report form, a sample workshop program and reports on the use of aides follow on pages 23 - 28.

IX. Describe the nature and extent of community and parent involvement in Title I programs in your State. Include outstanding examples of parent and the community involvement in Title I projects.

The responsibility of placing parents of deprived children on LEA advisory and planning committees was placed on the LEA's by the requirement from the U. S. Office of Education. The SEA insisted that this be done, and also urged the LEA's to write into the project application plans for involving the parents and community in school activities. Although there were some doubts on the part of the LEAs about the advisability of involving uneducated parents and of having success in getting the parent involved, a very good beginning was made this year. At State area meetings the LEA's were encouraged to exchange ideas of successful involvement and of the attempts which failed. This was considered very helpful. Reports of involvement are included. A contact person is named on each report.

SYSTEM HALE COUNTY

IN-SERVICE TRAINING AND/OR WORKSHOP REPORT

Type; In-Service or Special Workshop	Group Involved Ex.: Math teachers Librarians, Teacher Aides	Number of Partici-pants	Length of Time Hours	Days	Total	Consultant or Leader	Cost
Reading 1-3	Lower Elementary Teachers	20	5	5	25	Dr. Joe Gutkoska	$1500.00
	Teacher Aides	15	5	2	10		
Reading 4-6	Upper Elementary Teachers	21	5	5	25	Mrs. Ann Lamkins	1500.00
	Teacher Aides	10	5	2	10		
Reading 7-12	English Teachers	10	5	5	25	Mrs. Majorie White	1500.00
	Librarians	7	5	5	25		
	Teacher & Library Aides	10	5	2	10		
Math 1-6 .	Elementary Teachers	21	5	5	25	Miss Venia Chamlee	1500.00
	Teacher Aides	10	5	2	10		
Math 7-12	Math Teachers	14	5	5	25	Dr. Larry Miller	1500.00
	Teacher Aides	5	5	2	10		
Physical Education 1-12	Elem. & H.S. P.E. Teachers	16	5	5	25	Miss Mabel Robinson	
	Teacher Aides	10	5	2	10	Mr. Ghary Ackers	00
Reading (In-Service)	Elementary Teachers (Reading)	8	3	2	6	Mrs. Madie Poole	00
	Teacher Aides						

Number of stipends given 6 Amount $ 2009.94

Number of meetings involving parents 10

Education Aides Amendment to Title I: ---- "in the case of projects involving the use of education aides, the LEA sets forth well-developed plans providing for coordinated programs of training in which education aides and the professional staff whom they are assisting will participate together".
(If 9 teachers and 4 aides are in a workshop, list it in that way, rather than as 13 participants).

Monday, August 4, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Devotional - Announcements - Introduction of Guests
8:10 - 9:00	"Prospectus of Teacher Aide Training Program"- Dr. Harold Collins
9:00 - 9:30	"The Future of the Teacher Aide" - Dr. John Shelton
9:30 - 10:30	Break
10:30 - 11:30	"Education Professions Development Act and the Teacher Aide Training Program"- Dr. John Hill
11:30 - 12:00	"Title I Objectives and the Teacher Aide"- Mrs, Manell Langford
12:00 - 12:30	"The Principal and the Teacher Aide"- Mr. M. E. Graham
12:30 - 1:00	"Objectives of the Teacher Aide Training Program" - Mr B. C. Botts

Tuesday, August 5, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Good Morning! Announcements - Introduction of Guests
8:10 - 9:00	"Varied Opportunities of Service for the Teacher Aide" - Dr. Braxton Nail
9:00 - 10:30	Break into groups: Group A - Art Work Group B - The Reading Program Group C - Working with Music
10:30 - 11:00	Break
11:00 - 12:00	Rotate Groups
12:00 - 1:00	Rotate Groups

Thrusday, August 7, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Good Morning! - Announcements - Introduction of Guests

8:10 - 8:40	"Audio Visuals" - Mr. Edward K. Wood
8:40 - 9:30	"Educational Television" - Mr. Horace McWhorter
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 10:30	"Health and Physical Education" - Mr. Kenneth Blankenship
10:30 - 11:00	"The Classroom Teacher and the Teacher Aide" - Mrs. Ruth Collins
11:00 - 11:30	"Self Evaluation" - Mrs. Ann Harmon
11:30 - 12:00	"Guidance in the Local Educational Agency Mrs. Virginia Greer
12:00 - 12:30	"Use and Maintenance of Equipment" - Mr. Don Walker
12:30 - 1:00	"Transportation of Children in the Public School" - Mr. Herman Youngblood

Friday, August 8, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Good Morning! Announcements - Introduction of Guests
8:10 - 8:40	"The Troy City System and Special Education" - Mr. Joe Dotson
8:40 - 9:30	"Special Education in Alabama"- Mrs. Anne Ramsey
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 10:30	"School Food Service" - Mrs. Ruth Lee
10:30 - 11:00	"Our Plans for the Use of Aides in the Troy City System" - Mr. Henry Greer
11:00 - 11:30	"Physical Education and the Teacher Aide" - Mr. Bob Boothe
11:30 - 12:00	"My Experience as a Teacher Aide" - Mrs. Louise Matthews
12:00 - 12:45	"The Instructional Program and the Teacher Aide"- Mr. Fletcher Jones
12:45 - 1:00	Summary of Past Week - Prospectus for the next week

Monday, August 11, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Good Morning! Announcements - (Question Box, etc.)
8:10 - 9:30	Films: "Feltboard in Teaching" "Bulletin Boards" - Staff Discussion: Ways you can assist with different type boards, etc.
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 1:00	Film, "Tape Recording for Instruction" Discuss - (groups) learn techniques, tape recorder - Staff

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Announcements
8:10 - 9:00	"The Role of the Aide in Working with the First and Second Grade Teachers" - Mrs. Lucile Jiles
9:00 - 9:30	Film, "Using the 16MM Film" - Staff
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 1:00	Discuss film -break into groups - operation techniques of 16MM projector - Staff

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Announcements
8:10 - 9:30	Ethics "Aide's Responsibility to System, School, and Teacher" - Staff
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 11:30	Film - "Make A Mighty Reach" Discussion - Staff
11:30 - 12:30	"Library, the - A Place for Discovery" "Let's Make Puppets" Discuss - Demonstrate - Staff
12:30 - 1:00	Discussion - Staff

Thursday, August 14, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Announcements
8:10 - 9:30	Library Skills an Aide Might Find Valuable - Mrs. Eloise Kirk
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 1:00	"Techniques of Using Overhead Projector" - a. Transparencies - b. Stencils - c. Change Bulbs - Staff

Friday, August 15, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Announcements
8:10 - 9:30	Techniques of Storytelling and Reading to children Age K through 12- (Techniques and available sources for above) - Mrs. Eloise Kirk
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 12:00	Film, "Children Learn from Filmstrips" Filmstrip Machine - Techniques - (Groups) - Staff
12:00 - 1:00	Evaluate and Next Week's Plans - Staff (Suggestion Box)

Monday, August 18, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Announcements
8:10 - 9:00	Film, "Creating Instructional Materials" - Staff
9:00 - 9:30	Mounting Pictures
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 1:00	a. Mounting Pictures (dry, etc.) - b. Lifting Pictures - c. Lamination - Staff

Tuesday, August 19, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Announcements
8:10 - 9:00	Clerical - Betty Jean Bryan Aide, Pike County High School
9:00 - 9:30	Stencils for offset press - Staff
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 1:00	Lunch Reports, Class Record Book, Monthly Report, Inventories, etc. - Mrs. Ruth Lee and Staff

Wednesday, August 20, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Announcements
8:10 - 9:30	"Techniques for Making Requisition, Using Bid Catalog" - Mr. Don Walker
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 12:00	Techniques for using sound filmstrip machine, copying machine, camera, Headsets, reading machine, record players, mitro reader - Staff
12:00 - 1:00	"Question and Answers" Film - Staff

Thursday, August 21, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Announcements
8:10 - 1:00	This day will be spent in an inservice meeting with faculty and staff of the Banks Model School, Banks Junior High School, Banks, Alabama

Friday, August 22, 1969

8:00 - 8:10	Announcements
8:10 - 9:30	Self-Evaluation - Group and Staff
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 12:00	Planning for involvement in 1969-70 school year with individual schools
12:00 - 1:00	Certification Awards

WORKSHOPS FUNDED BY TITLE I - PUBLIC LAW 89-10--1968-69

TITLE	DATE	LOCATION	CONTACT PERSON	NUMBER ATTENDING
Elementary Science and Math	June 17-18	Mobile	Miss Erline Curlee	300
	June 25-26	Jacksonville	Miss Erline Curlee	
Speech Education Workshop	April 15-17	Birmingham	Mrs. Dorothy Schwartz	115
	April 7-9	Jacksonville	Mrs. Dorothy Schwartz	123
Reading	June 9-10	Montgomery	Mrs. Nelle Hause	339
	June 12-13	Mobile	Mrs. Nelle Hause	189
	June 23-24	Birmingham	Mrs. Nelle Hause	247
	June 26-27	Huntsville	Mrs. Nelle Hause	225
Art	June 23-24	Huntsville	Miss Sarah Johnson	37
	June 26-27	Mobile	Miss Sarah Johnson	18
New Principals	August 3-9	Univ. of So. Ala.	Mr. Allen Knox	59
Health Education	June 9-27	Univ. of Ala.	Mrs. Jimmie Goodman	62
Art	May 3	Jacksonville	Mrs. Jessie Jones	27
Foreign Language	June 24-26	Selma	Miss Joanna Breedlove	85
Music	May 2-3	Decatur	Mr. Marshall Spann	86
Math	June 11-13	Montgomery	Mr. Lloyd Crook	102
Counselor	June 26-27	Univ. of Ala.	Mr. Clifton Nash	159
Social Studies	June 17-19	Univ. of So. Ala.	Mr. Russell Berry	83
ETV - AV	June 12-13	Univ. of So. Ala.	Dr. Edwin Williams	39

TITLE	DATE	LOCATION	CONTACT PERSON	NUMBER ATTENDING
Industrial Arts	June 5-6	Ala. A & M College	Mr. Delbert Kennedy	28
	August 19-20	Univ. of So. Ala.	Mr. Delbert Kennedy	21
School Lunch Personnel	June 2-6	Florence	Miss Melissa Emory	1187
	June 9-13	Mobile	Miss Melissa Emory	
	June 16-20	Huntsville	Miss Melissa Emory	
	June 23-27	Tuscaloosa	Miss Melissa Emory	
Elementary Physical Education	July 21 to August 1	Athens	Mr. Ghary Akers	83
Traffic Safety and Driver Education	June 16-27 July 14-25	Ala. A & M College	Mr. J. H. Boockholdt	171
	June 9-20 July 28-Aug. 8	Ala. State (Montg.)	Mr. J. H. Boockholdt	
	July 14-25 August 4-15	Univ. of So. Ala.	Mr. J. H. Boockholdt	
	June 30-July 11 July 28-Aug. 8	Univ. of Ala.(B'ham)	Mr. J. H. Boockholdt	
	June 16-27 July 7-18	Univ. of Montevallo	Mr. J. H. Boockholdt	
Title I and III Summer Conference	June 17, 18, 19	Montgomery	W. E. Mellown, Jr.	450
Institutions for Delinquent	May 19	Birmingham	Mr. John Carr	57

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 69-70

SYSTEM Statewide

TITLE I SCHOOLS

NAME OF TEST: California Achievement Test 1963 Edition 1963 National Norms

	Grade	Section of Test	Month and Year Tested	Form	Number of Students	Mean Score Grade Placement	Number of Students			
							25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	99th %ile
Pre	1	Total Reading	11-68	W	1,881	1.3	880	398	268	335
Post	1		5-69	X	3,094	1.7	1,116	813	444	721
Pre	2	Total Reading	10-68	W	8,033	1.9	2,999	1,821	1,504	1,709
Post	2		5-69	X	5,242	2.6	1,860	1,070	1,068	1,244
Pre	3	Total Reading	10-68	W	8,202	2.8	2,687	2,090	1,618	1,807
Post	3		5-69	X	5,997	3.5	1,804	1,332	1,215	1,646
Pre	4	Total Reading	9-68	W	19,087	3.8	6,495	5,905	3,106	3,581
Post	4		5-69	X	10,017	4.4	3,366	2,617	2,007	2,027
Pre	5	Total Reading	9-68	W	10,630	4.6	4,046	2,710	1,945	1,929
Post	5		5-69	X	8,297	5.1	2,989	2,039	1,677	1,592
Pre	6	Total Reading	10-68	W	19,161	5.2	7,875	4,741	3,160	3,385
Post	6		5-69	Y	11,035	5.7	4,236	2,869	1,963	1,967

Students: Rural_____ Urban_____ Mixed_____ *

*See listing on back of this page

Grade	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	R - 450 U - 1,145 M - 286	R - 1,704 U - 814 M - 576
LEA's	R - 1 M - 2 U - 2	R - 6 U - 2 M - 5
2	R - 3,679 U - 1,977 M - 2,377	R - 2,529 U - 1,535 M - 1,178
LEA's	R - 11 U - 6 M - 7	R - 11 U - 7 M - 5
3	R - 3,822 U - 1,796 M - 2,584	R - 3,470 U - 1,222 M - 1,305
LEA's	R - 21 U - 6 M - 9	R - 18 U - 6 M - 7
4	R - 7,914 U - 1,720 M - 9,453	R - 4,530 U - 1,393 M - 4,094
LEA's	R - 25 U - 19 M - 7	R - 19 U - 8 M - 13
5	R - 4,747 U - 1,863 M - 4,020	R - 4,234 U - 1,484 M - 2,579
LEA's	R - 22 U - 7 M - 15	R - 21 U - 8 M - 12
6	R - 7,975 U - 1,961 M - 9,225	R - 5,384 U - 1,534 M - 4,117
LEA's	R - 25 U - 8 M - 19	R - 21 U - 9 M - 12

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 69-70

SYSTEM Statewide

TITLE I SCHOOLS

NAME OF TEST: California Achievement Test 1963 Edition 1963 National Norms

	Grade	Section of Test	Month and Year Tested	Form	Number of Students	Mean Score Grade Placement	Number of Students			
							25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	99th %ile
Pre	7	Total Reading	9-68	W	10,203	6.2	3,959	2,724	1,824	1,696
Post	7		5-69	Y	10,332	6.9	3,702	2,614	1,917	2,099
Pre	8	Total Reading	9-68	Y	26,982	7.0	12,123	5,770	4,801	4,288
Post	8		5-69	W	11,881	7.4	4,634	2,456	2,323	2,468
Pre	9	Total Reading	9-68	W	6,964	8.0	2,765	1,711	1,335	1,153
Post	9		5-69	Y	5,805	8.2	2,189	1,313	1,277	1,026
Pre	10	Total Reading	9-68	W	6,554	9.0	2,207	1,908	1,347	1,092
Post	10		5-69	X	5,394	9.4	1,886	1,409	1,200	899
Pre	11	Total Reading	9-68	X	20,282	9.9	8,645	4,750	3,762	3,125
Post	11		5-69	W	4,754	10.0	1,775	1,117	1,064	798
Pre	12	Total Reading								
Post	12									

Students: Rural_____ Urban_____ Mixed_____*

*See listing on back of this page.

Grade	Pre-Test	Post-Test
7	R - 4,017 U - 2,240 M - 3,946	R - 4,012 U - 1,477 M - 4,843
LEA's	R - 20 U - 6 M - 13	R - 19 U - 4 M - 13
8	R - 11,391 U - 7,928 M - 7,663	R - 4,611 U - 2,098 M - 5,172
LEA's	R - 31 U - 10 M - 23	R - 19 U - 7 M - 11
9	R - 3,543 U - 905 M - 2,516	R - 2,575 U - 1,358 M - 1,872
LEA's	R - 14 U - 2 M - 10	R - 13 U - 4 M - 9
10	R - 2,268 U - 2,207 M - 2,079	R - 2,861 U - 1,411 M - 1,122
LEA's	R - 13 U - 4 M - 7	R - 15 U - 3 M - 6
11	R - 8,218 U - 6,765 M - 5,299	R - 2,331 U - 1,238 M - 1,185
LEA's	R - 27 U - 9 M - 19	R - 13 U - 5 M - 7

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 69-70

SYSTEM Statewide

TITLE I SCHOOLS

NAME OF TEST: California Achievement Test 1963 Edition 1963 National Norms

	Grade	Section of Test	Month and Year Tested	Form	Number of Students	Mean Score Grade Placement	Number of Students			
							25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	99th %ile
Pre	1	Total Arithmetic	11-68	W	1,863	1.4	775	468	258	362
Post	1		4-69	X	2,487	1.7	856	576	408	647
Pre	2	Total Arithmetic	9-68	W	7,240	1.8	2,165	1,968	1,432	1,675
Post	2		4-69	X	4,554	2.5	1,258	1,193	840	1,263
Pre	3	Total Arithmetic	10-68	W	6,023	3.0	1,697	1,396	1,222	1,708
Post	3		4-69	X	5,065	3.8	1,111	889	1,066	1,999
Pre	4	Total Arithmetic	10-68	W	16,413	4.2	4,168	4,776	3,196	4,273
Post	4		4-69	X	7,021	4.8	1,757	1,698	1,569	1,997
Pre	5	Total Arithmetic	10-68	W	7,235	5.1	2,318	1,659	1,427	1,831
Post	5		4-69	X	5,347	5.5	1,760	1,132	1,007	1,448
Pre	6	Total Arithmetic	10-68	W	15,991	5.7	6,603	3,831	2,897	2,660
Post	6		4	Y	8,896	6.0	3,690	1,865	1,671	1,670

Students: Rural_____ Urban_____ Mixed_____ *

Grade	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	R - 451 U - 1,151 M - 261	R - 1,456 U - 512 M - 519
LEA's	R - 1 U - 2 M - 1	R - 5 U - 2 M - 2
2	R - 3,072 U - 1,533 M - 2,635	R - 2,467 U - 857 M - 1,230
LEA's	R - 7 U - 3 M - 7	R - 9 U - 2 M - 5
3	R - 2,450 U - 1,507 M - 2,066	R - 2,800 U - 792 M - 1,473
LEA's	R - 9 U - 3 M - 6	R - 9 U - 2 M - 6
4	R - 6,690 U - 1,529 M - 8,194	R - 2,537 U - 1,210 M - 3,274
LEA's	R - 13 U - 5 M - 13	R - 8 U - 6 M - 8
5	R - 2,986 U - 1,496 M - 2,753	R - 2,732 U - 961 M - 1,654
LEA's	R - 11 U - 4 M - 9	R - 12 U - 4 M - 7
6	R - 6,627 U - 1,563 M - 7,801	R - 3,454 U - 998 M - 4,444
LEA's	R - 15 U - 4 M - 13	R - 12 U - 4 M - 9

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 69-70

SYSTEM Statewide

TITLE I SCHOOLS

NAME OF TEST: California Achievement Test 19 63 Edition 1963 National Norms

	Grade	Section of Test	Month and Year Tested	Form	Number of Students	Mean Score Grade Placement	Number of Students			
							25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	99th %ile
Pre	7	Total Arithmetic	9-68	X	6,901	6.7	3,049	1,664	1,064	1,124
Post	7		4-69	Y	5,884	7.2	2,551	1,531	945	857
Pre	8	Total Arithmetic	9-68	Y	24,809	7.4	12,971	4,963	3,824	3,051
Post	8		4-69	X	8,403	7.6	4,139	1,681	1,342	1,241
Pre	9	Total Arithmetic	9-68	X	3,814	8.0	1,867	874	597	476
Post	9		4-69	Y	2,956	8.1	1,252	626	586	492
Pre	10	Total Arithmetic	9-68	X	4,292	8.7	1,998	902	726	666
Post	10		4-69	Y	2,411	8.6	1,066	520	416	409
Pre	11	Total Arithmetic	9-68	X	18,585	9.1	9,003	3,520	3,157	2,905
Post	11		4-69	Y	2,656	9.2	1,136	525	513	482
Pre	12	Total Arithmetic								
Post	12									

Students: Rural_____ Urban_____ Mixed_____ *

*See listing on back of this page

Grade	Pre-Test	Post-Test
7	R - 1,805 U - 846 M - 4,250	R - 1,568 U - 223 M - 4,093
LEA's	R - 6 U - 2 M - 12	R - 6 U - 1 M - 7
8	R - 9,601 U - 7,653 M - 7,555	R - 2,421 U - 866 M - 5,116
LEA's	R - 22 U - & M - 21	R - 8 U - 3 M - 7
9	R - 1,060 U - 592 M - 2,162	R - 1,146 U - 0 M - 1,810
LEA's	R - 4 U - 1 M - 7	R - 4 U - 0 M - 7
10	R - 1,954 U - 0 M - 2,338	R - 1,468 U - 0 M - 943
LEA's	R - 7 U - 0 M - 8	R - 6 U - 0 M - 5
11	R - 7,162 U - 6,491 M - 4,932	R - 1,283 U - 187 M - 1,186
LEA's	R - 21 U - 8 M - 18	R - 6 U - 2 M - 6

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 69-70

SYSTEM Statewide

TITLE I SCHOOLS

NAME OF TEST: California Achievement Test 1963 Edition 19 63 National Norms

	Grade	Section of Test	Month and Year Tested	Form	Number of Students	Mean Score Grade Placement	Number of Students			
							25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	99th %ile
Pre	1	Total Language	11-68	W	1785	1.4	680	346	331	428
Post	1		4-69	X	1611	1.7	528	313	272	498
Pre	2	Total Language	10-68	W	7140	2.0	2333	1728	1415	1664
Post	2		4-69	X	4030	2.6	1694	701	583	1052
Pre	3	Total Language	10-68	W	6456	3.1	1861	1696	1238	1661
Post	3		4-69	X	4005	3.6	991	849	790	1375
Pre	4	Total Language	10-68	W	16,410	4.0	5102	5228	2691	3389
Post	4		4-69	X	6374	4.4	2329	1687	1061	1297
Pre	5	Total Language	10-68		7562	4.8	2712	1719	1388	1743
Post	5		4-69		5389	5.2	2095	1139	981	1174
Pre	6	Total Language	10-68		16,566	5.5	7040	3837	2803	2886
Post	6	Total Language	4-69		8971	5.6	3791	1926	1601	1653

Students: Rural_____ Urban_____ Mixed_____*

*See listing on the back of this page

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
GRADE 1	R - 1139 U - 440 M - 206	R - 604 U - 208 M - 799
LEA's	R - 2 M - 1 U - 1	R - 3 M - 4 U - 1
GRADE 2	R - 3224 U - 739 M - 3177	R - 1737 U - 878 M - 1415
LEA's	R - 6 U - 2 M - 9	R - & U - 2 M - &
GRADE 3	R - 3412 U - 796 M - 2248	R - 1576 U - 780 M - 1649
LEA's	R - 10 U - 2 M - 6	R - 7 U - 2 M - 7
GRADE 4	R - 7317 U - 715 M - 8378	R - 2012 U - 900 M - 3462
LEA's	R - 16 U - 1 M - 14	R - 9 O - 3 M - 9
GRADE 5	R - 3962 U - 677 M - 2923	R - 2599 U - 897 M - 1893
LEA's	R - 14 U - 1 M - 10	R - 12 U - 3 M - 8
GRADE 6	R - 7641 U - 752 M - 8173	R - 3642 U - 944 M - 4385
LEA's	R - 18 U - 1 M - 14	R - 13 U - 3 M - 10

Note: R - Rural; M - Mixed; U - Urban

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 69-70

SYSTEM Statewide

TITLE I SCHOOLS

NAME OF TEST: California Achievement Test 1963 Edition 1963 National Norms

	Grade	Section of Test	Month and Year Tested	Form	Number of Students	Mean Score Grade Placement	Number of Students			
							25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	99th %ile
Pre	7	Total Language	9-68	X	6,331	6.5	2,563	1,438	1,119	1,211
Post	7		4-69	Y	7,098	6.9	3,060	1,441	1,206	1,391
Pre	8	Total Language	9-68	Y	26,623	7.1	12,431	5,321	4315	4,056
Post	8		4-69	X	8,378	7.5	3,238	1,712	1,784	1,644
Pre	9	Total Language	9-68	X	3,764	7.8	1,476	841	780	667
Post	9		4-69	Y	2,748	8.0	1,071	632	587	458
Pre	10	Total Language	9-68	X	3,848	9.4	1,396	935	779	738
Post	10		4-69	Y	2,419	9.6	860	487	490	582
Pre	11	Total Language	9-68	X	19,751	10.1	7,769	4,045	4,200	3,737
Post	11		4-69	Y	2,396	10.3	838	515	533	510
Pre	12	Total Language								
Post	12									

Students: Rural_____ Urban_____ Mixed_____*

*See listing on the back of this page

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
GRADE 7	R - 1661 U - 648 M - 4022	R - 2250 U - 224 M -4624
LEA's	R - 8 U - 1 M - 11	R - 9 U - 1 M - 8
GRADE 8	R - 11,156 U - 7633 M - 7834	R - 2735 U - 847 M - 4796
LEA's	R - 26 U - 7 M - 21	R - 9 U - 3 M - 6
GRADE 9	R - 900 U - 789 M - 2075	R - 1436 U - 0 M - 1312
LEA's	R - 4 U - 2 M - 7	R - 6 U - 0 M - 6
GRADE 10	R - 1128 U - 761 M - 1959	R - 1436 U - 0 M - 983
LEA's	R - 5 U - 2 M - 7	R - 6 U - 0 M - 5
GRADE 11	R - 8427 U - 5269 M - 6055	R - 1481 U - 174 M - 741
LEA's	R - 22 U - 8 M - 19	R - 7 U - 2 M - 3

Note: R - Rural; M - Mixed; U - Urban

OTHER TESTS GIVEN BY LEA'S IN FY 69

READING TESTS

Name of Test and Company

Basic Reading Test - Houghton, 1966
Form A Reading - Scott Foresman, Reading Program 1968
Metropolitan Readiness - Harcourt, Brace, World 1959
Stanford Diagnostic Levels 1 and 2 - Harcourt, Brace, World 1965
Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty - Harcourt, Brace, World
Gilmore Oral Reading - Harcourt, Brace, World
Gray Oral - Bobbs-Merrill Company 1963
Triggs Diagnostic Test
Pre-Reading - Ginn and Company
Botel Reading Inventory - Follett
Harrison Stroud Reading - Houghton Mifflin
Macmillan Spectrum Placement - Macmillan
Pre-Primer, Primer, First Grade - Science Research Associates
Reading Locator Test - Science Research Associates
Laboratory III A - Science Research Associates
Phonics Survey - Science Research Associates
Individual Silent - Science Research Associates
Perceptual Development
McCall-Crabb - Teachers College Press 1961
Durkin - Meshover Phonics - Teachers College
Gates - McKillop - Teachers College Press 1965
Gates - Peardon - Teachers College Press 1965
Temple - Darlin Speech
Listen and Hear Series - Paul S. Amidon and Association
Specific Skilltests - Barnell Loft, Ltd.
Doren Diagnostic - Ed. Test Bureau
Slosson Oral Reading 1963 - Slosson Educational Publications
CYO Word Attack
Lee-Clark Readiness - California Test Bureau
Diagnostic Survey - California Test Bureau
California Reading Test - California Test Bureau
Dolch Basic Sight - Garrard Press
New Practice Readers Tests - McGraw-Hill
Diagnostic Test of Word Perception - McGraw-Hill
Diagnostic Reading Test - Mt. Home, N. C.
Gates - MacGinitie - Teachers College Press 1965
Gray - Votaw Rogers
I. T. A.
Phonics Survey
Diagnostic Reading Test - Charles E. Merrill Company 1966
Iowa Silent Reading Tests - Harcourt, Brace
Nelson Reading Test 1958
Webster's Diagnostic - McGraw-Hill
Webster's Skill Card Test - McGraw-Hill
New Practic Readers - McGraw-Hill
Mc Call-Harby
Reading - Ginn and Company

READING TESTS

Name of Test and Company

Disability Analysis - Kattmeyer
Diagnostic Reading - Lyons, Carnahan Company 1965
Basic Sight Words - Garrard Publishing Company
RFU - Reading for Understanding - SRA
Readers Digest
Reading Skills - SRA 1957
Reading Comprehension - Barnell Loft 1962
Reading Skill text I and II - Merrill Company 1961
Reading tests from "Know your World" - American Education Publishers

SUBJECT TESTS

Name of Test and Company

Diagnostic Spelling Test - Webster Publishing Company
Ayres - Spelling
Kwalwasser - Dykema - Music
Drake Muscial Aptitude - Music
Elementary Algebra - American Guidance
Advanced Algebra - American Guidance
Plane Geometry - American Guidance
Math Unit Test - Silver Burdett
Mult - Level Mathematics - Science Research Associates
National Spanish Exam. - National Spanish Contests
Temple - Darlin Speech
AAHPER - Physical Fitness
Kraus - Weber -
Writing Skill - Science Research Associates
T. E. A. - Science Research Associates
Y. E. P. - Science Research Associates
Cooperative Algebra Aptitude - Educational Testing Service
Cooperative Spanish Aptitude - Educational Testing Service
ITED Social Studies
ITED Mathematics
ERC Stenographic Aptitude
Orleans Algebra Prognosis, World Book Company
Algebra I and II - California Test Bureau
Bioglogy - California Test Bureau
Chemistry - California Test Bureau
Diagnostic, Arith Test - Stanford
Betty Crocker Homemaker - S. R. A.
20th Century Typewriting - Southwestern Publishing Company
20th Century Bookkeeping and Accounting - Southwestern Publishing Company
Turse Clerical Aptitude - Harcourt, Brace and World

ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

Name of Test and Company

Wide Range Achievement - Western Psy. Service I
Metropolitan
Iowa Test of Educational Development
California Achievement Test
American Achievement Test
Science Research Associates Achievement Test
Sequential Test of Educational Development
Stanford
General Aptitude Test Battery (GABT) - United Stated Printing Office
National Education Development Test - SRA
National Merit - National Scholarship Corporation
American College Test - ACT Program, Incorporated

INTELLIGENCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS

Name of Test and Company

Draw - A - Man - World Book Company
Slosson - SIT - Slosson Educational Publications
Goodenough Harris Drawing Scale
P.M.A. Primary Mental Abilities
Otis Quick Scoring - Harcourt - Brace
Otis - Alpha
Otis - Beta
Otis - Lennon - Harcourt, Brace
Stanford Binet Clinical Observation - American Psy. Assn.
W. I. S. C.
W. I. S. A.
T. A. T.
Wechsler - Bellevue Intelligence Scale - American Psy. Ann.
Stanford - Binet - Houghton-Mifflin
Eschler Intelligence - Science Research Associates
Peabody Picture Vocabulary - American Guidance
Bender Gestalt - A. Orthopsychiatric Association
Kuhlman - Anderson - Personnel Press, Incorporated
Large - Thorndike - Houghton
Organic Brain Damage - Western Psychology
HarrisTest of Lateral Dominance
California Mental Maturity
Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abiltiy
WAIS - The Psychological Company
Henmon Nelson - Houghton Mifflin
Mooney Problem Check List - Psychological Corportion
Personal Adjustment Inventory - Carl Rogers Assn. Press
Rorschach - American Psychological Corporation
Thematic Apperception - American Psychological Corporation
Hunt Minn. - Organic Brain Damage - American Psychological Corporation
M. M. P. I. - American Psychological Corporation

APTITUDE AND INTEREST TESTS

Name of Test and Company

Differntial Aptitudes - Psychological Corporation
Test of Educational Ability - Science Research Associates
Occupational Interest - C. T. B.
Occupational Exploration - Science Research Associates
Apititude Tests of Occupations - S. T. B.
Preliminary Scholastic - E.T. S.
Guidance Inventory - Ralph Galligher
Academic Promise Test - Psychological Corporation
Kuder Preference Inventory - Science Research Associates
Flanagon Aptitude Test
Military Aptitude - U. S. Government
National Education Development - SRA
General Aptitude Intelligence Battery - U. S. Supt. of Documents